

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/788,110 02/15/2001 Maurizio Zanetti UCSD-07017 2849 **EXAMINER** 05/01/2006 MAHA A. HAMDAN UNGAR, SUSAN NMN

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP 101 HOWARD STREET, SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO " CA 94105

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1642

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/788,110	ZANETTI, MAURIZIO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Susan Ungar	1642	•	

- or	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Susan Ungar	1642		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		-		
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff of the of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31: or (3)	
 a) The period for reply expires months from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection wh	chever is later. In	
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.	
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee	
	diana with 27 OFB 44 27 months	er Etalogistatus		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	e appeal. Since	
	had asianta tha data at 60 and a 10 a			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the	
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protent the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) □ wil vided below or appended.	I be entered and an e	xplanation of	
Claim(s) allowed: none.				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>19,21,22 and 24-35</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>13-18</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT</u> OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	0	
		Ausan	La	
		Susan Ungar Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1642	0 3	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added limitations require a new search because they are drawn specifically to SEQ ID NO:23 and a search of SEQ ID NO:23 would be required to properly evaluate the claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: If the amendment had been entered claims 19,21,22 and 24-35 would remain rejected for the reasons previously set forth in the paper mailed February 13, 2006, Section 4, pages 2-3.

Applicant argues that the specification is drawn not only to anticancer vaccine but also to a method for inducing and enhancing a CTL response against cancer cells wherein support is found in Figures 1 and 2 describing induction of CTL against hTRT in normal PBMC and PBMC from prostate cancer patients. The argument has been considered but has not been found persuasive because none of the specification, claims as originally filed nor the art of record enables the claimed invention for the reasons of record.

Applicant argues that Examiner is reading the limitation of a universal cancer vaccine into the claims and that this is improper. The argument has been considered but has not been found persuasive and it is appropriate to read the claims in light of the specification for the reasons of record.

Since the amendment has not been entered claims 19, 23-25 remain rejected for the reasons previously set forth in the paper mailed February 13, 2006, Section 6, page 3.

Applicant argues that amendment of the claims obviates the instant rejection. The argument is moot since the amendment has not been entered.

Since the amendment has not been entered, Claims 19, 24-29, 33-36 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for the reasons previously set forth in the Paper mailed February 13, 2006, Section 6, pages 3-4.

Applicant argues that amendment of the claims obviates the instant rejection. The argument is moot since the amendment has not been entered.

Since the amendment has not been entered, Claims 19, 24-29, 33-36 remain rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for the reasons previously set forth in the Paper mailed February 13, 2005, Section 7, pages 4-5.

Applicant argues that amendment of the claims obviates the instant rejection. The argument is moot since the amendment has not been entered.